REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 16 are amended for purposes of expediting prosecution. The limitations of claim 5 are now in amended claim 1, and the limitations of claim 11 are now in amended claim 7. Claims 6, and 16 are similarly amended. Claims 5, 11, and 12 are canceled without prejudice.

New claims 19, 20, and 21 are added to claim the invention in alternative language. The new claims are thought to be patentable over the cited prior art because the combination of limitations is not seen to be suggested by the prior art. Specifically, new claim 19 includes the combination of limitations of configuring the data processing system into at least two partitions. Each partition includes a processor arrangement hosting an operating system, and each operating system is coupled to a management interface processor of the data processing system. A plurality of instances of an independently operable console view are initiated on a plurality of computer systems coupled to the management interface processor. At least two instances of a system operations program are initiated on at least two of the computer systems, respectively, and each instance of the system operations program is coupled to a respective partition. An operations interface program is initiated on each of the at least two computer systems that has an instance of the system operations program. The operations interface programs receive connection requests from the instances of the console view, and each connection request specifies an instance of the system operations program. In response to a connection request that specifies an instance of the system operations program that is not hosted on the computer system that hosts the operations interface program at which the connection request was received, the operations interface program returns to the instance of the console view that sent the connection request, a code that identifies the one of the computer systems that hosts the instance of the system operations program specified in the connection request. In response to a connection request that specifies an instance of the system operations program that is hosted on the computer system hosting the operations interface program at which the connection request was received, the operations interface program creates a connection between the operations interface program and the

10

instance of the console view. Each operations interface program transfers each connection with a console view to an instance of the system operations program specified in the connection request from the console view. Data from the partition coupled to the instance of the system operations program and data from the console view are transmitted between each instance of a console view and the connected instance of the system operations program. The prior art is not understood to suggest this combination of limitations.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 13-21 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action fails a *prima facie* case of double patenting of claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16 of the present application over claims 1, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,764B1. The rejection is respectfully traversed because the limitations of the claims of the present application are not shown to be obvious over the claims of Patent No. 6,728,764B1. No showing is made that the limitations of the combination including the particularly configured operations server and display stations are obvious over the claims of Patent No. 6,728,764B1. The rejection simply offers a table with arrows, and fails to address all the limitations of the claims. Furthermore, the claims of the present application are thought to be non-obvious over the prior art cited in the Office Action. Therefore, the double patenting rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1-18 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over "Zalewski" (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,508 to Zalewski et al.) in view of "Stedman" (U.S. Patent No. 5,968,119 to Stedman et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations are suggested by the references and fails to provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of Zalewski with teachings of Stedman.

The limitations of claims 5 and 11 (now canceled and included in claims 1, 6, 7, and 16) are not shown to be suggested by the Zalewski-Stedman combination. Specifically, the claimed operations interface program does not correspond to

11

Stedman's RUMBA connectivity software as apparently alleged. Stedman's RUMBA simply establishes connectivity between a PC and a host, and the claimed operations interface program transfers a connection with an instance of a console view to an instance of a systems operations program. Stedman does no apparent transferring of connections. Furthermore, Stedman's host extension is alleged to correspond to the claimed systems operations program, and there is no suggestion by Stedman, nor any apparent rationale for transfer of any RUMBA connection to a host extension. Stedman apparently seeks to eliminate the time and expense associated with "existing methods of accessing information from host computers, which presumably include the RUMBA approach. Thus, the limitations are not suggested by Stedman, and modifying Stedman's approach of FIG. 13 with the RUMBA approach would apparently frustrate the purpose of Stedman's invention.

As to claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16, the Zalewski-Stedman combination is not shown to suggest the claimed management interface processor and processing associated therewith. The Office Action alleges that Stedman's server application framework correspond to the claimed management interface processor. The claimed management interface processor does not correspond to Stedman's server application framework because Stedman's framework is apparently software, not a processor (col. 7, l. 1-5). Furthermore, the claimed management interface processor is a processor in addition to the claimed operations server computer system. This is not the case with Stedman's server application framework and server computer 108, which are alleged to correspond to the claimed management interface processor and operations server computer system. Stedman's server application framework is software that executes on a server computer (FIG. 13). Thus, the Office Action does not show that the Zalewski-Stedman combination suggests all the limitations of claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16.

The alleged motivation for modifying Zalewski with Stedman is improper. The alleged motivation states that "it would have been obvious ... to modify the methods/systems of Zalewski with the teachings of Stedman, in order to provide an improved access method or system avoiding the limitations of the multiplexer 228..." It is respectfully submitted that there is no apparent evidence to demonstrate Zalewski's

system provides a level of access that is less than desirable, nor is there any apparent evidence to demonstrate whether or how Stedman's terminal emulation approach would benefit Zalewski's architecture. Thus, the alleged motivation is conclusory and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 8, 14, and 17 depend from claims 1, 7, 13, and 16, respectively, and are not shown to be unpatentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 3, 9, 15, and 18 depend from claims 1, 7, 13, and 16, respectively, and are not shown to be unpatentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 4 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and are not shown to be unpatentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

The rejection of claims 1-18 over the Zalewski-Stedman combination should be withdrawn because the Office Action fails to show all the limitations are suggested by the combination, fails to provide a proper motivation for combining the references, and fails to show that the combination could be made with a reasonable likelihood of success.

Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the remarks set forth above.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (USYS.020PA).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: _____
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274